

**REMARKS**

Claims 5-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 5, 8, 11, 14 and 15 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Support for amended claims 5, 8, 11 and 14 can be found, for example, in Figs. 1-4 and the corresponding portions of the specification. Claim 15 is amended to correct a minor informality. Claims 1-4 and 17-19 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein.

Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Vo at the interview held July 16, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

Initially, the Office Action, in paragraph 2, indicates that CN-A-1177150 was not considered in the Form PTO-1449 (filed on March 16, 2006) since it is in the Chinese language and thus does not comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(3)(i). However, MPEP §609.04(a)(III) explicitly states that a corresponding English language equivalent application provided with a foreign language reference satisfies the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.97 and 1.98, and MPEP §609, with respect to that foreign language reference. As discussed during the personal interview, and as set forth in the March 16 Information Disclosure Statement, CN-A-1177150 corresponds to U.S. Patent No. 5,715,453 to Stewart submitted in the March 16 Information Disclosure Statement. Because corresponding English language U.S. Patent No. 5,715,453 was submitted concurrently with CN-A-1177150, the Examiner must consider it. Applicants respectfully request prompt consideration of CN-A-1177150 on these grounds. Applicants request that an additional copy of the March 16, 2006 Form PTO-1449

be submitted with the next Patent Office communication indicating that CN-A-1177150 has been considered.

The Office Action, in paragraph 4, rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because it is allegedly unclear what an instruction form is. The cancellation of claims 1-4 and 17-19 renders the §112 rejection of claims 1-4 and 17-19 moot, and Applicants respectfully traverse the §112 rejection of claims 5-16.

Independent claims 5, 8, 11 and 14 are amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 5, 8, 11 and 14, and claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 5, 8, 11 and 14, are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 6, rejects claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because these claims allegedly recite descriptive materials, data structures, software, a program or a list. The cancellation of claims 1-4, 17 and 18 renders the §101 rejection of claims 1-4, 17 and 18 moot, and Applicants respectfully traverse the §101 rejection of claims 5-16.

Independent claims 5, 8, 11 and 14 are amended to obviate the rejection.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §101 rejection of claims 5, 8, 11 and 14, and claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 5, 8, 11 and 14, are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 8, rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by "PDA Access to Internet Content, Focus on Forms," at IEEE Proceedings of the 36<sup>th</sup> Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, pages 1-9, 2003 to Watters et al. (hereinafter "Watters"). The cancellation of claims 1-4 and 17-19 renders the §102(a) rejection of claims 1-4 and 17-19 moot, and Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(a) rejection of claims 5-16.

Watters cannot reasonably be considered to teach "a deletion part that causes the instruction form to be deleted from the storage and from the at least one of the plurality of instruction form execution apparatuses when the process indicated in the instruction form has been completed," as recited in independent claim 5, and similarly in independent claims 8, 11 and 14.

The Office Action asserts, in paragraph 8, that the submit button and the reset button, depicted in Fig. 4 of Watters, can reasonably be considered to correspond to the deletion part that deletes the instruction form when the execution part completes the execution of the process indicated in the instruction form. Specifically, the Office Action asserts: (1) the alleged form of Watters is cleared when the submit button is clicked, and thus the submit button corresponds to the claimed deletion part; and (2) if the alleged form is not cleared when the submit button is clicked, the reset button clears the alleged form when it is clicked and thus the reset button corresponds to the claimed deletion part.

At the outset, it should be noted that the teachings of Watters falls into the category of art discussed in the second paragraph on page 1, in the Background section of Applicants' disclosure. That is, that conventional systems, such as any that can reasonably be considered to be taught by Watters, require a user to inconveniently execute a number of steps separately. Shortfalls in the method disclosed in Watters are among the objectives that the subject matter of the pending claims are intended to address and to overcome.

Regarding assertion (1), Applicants submit that the submit button does not correspond to the claimed deletion part because the alleged form is not cleared when the submit button is clicked. Watters discloses a form that includes: text input areas that allows a user to enter text in a box; a submit button; and a reset button (see e.g., Fig. 4). Additionally, Watters, at page 5, left-hand col., lines 5-10, discloses that when the submit button is clicked, the completed form is sent back to the source server. The disclosure of Watters does not support

the assertion that the submit button deletes the form from the storage and from the at least one of the plurality of instruction form execution apparatuses when the process indicated in the instruction form has been completed, as recited in claim 5, and similarly recited in claims 8, 11 and 14. Accordingly, the Office Action fails where it asserts that the submit button of Watters corresponds to the claimed deletion part recited in claims 5, 8, 11 and 14.

Regarding assertion (2), without conceding the propriety of this assertion in the Office Action, the fact that a user is required to click on the reset button to clear the form renders the teachings of Watters inapplicable to the subject matter of the pending claims. The additional step of clicking on the reset button, as noted above, is one of the deficiencies of the art set forth on page 1, paragraph 2 of Applicants' disclosure. In contrast, the deletion part recited in claims 5, 8, 11 and 14, occurs without a user performing the additional step of clicking a button. In this regard, the reset button of Watters does not correspond to the claimed deletion part recited in claims 5, 8, 11 and 14.

For the reasons set forth above, Watters cannot reasonably be considered to teach the combinations of all of the features positively recited in at least independent claims 5, 8, 11 and 14. Further, claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16 are also not taught by Watters for at least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable independent claims 1, 5, 8, 11, and 14, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the applied reference are respectfully requested.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 5-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Timothy S. Smith

Registration No. 58,355

JAO:TSS/eks

Date: September 25, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE</b> <b>AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--